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CONTAINERLESS GLASS PROCESSING AND STUDIES

Motivations:

* Novel glasses and enhanced glassforming ability

Ultrapure glasses

Gas bubbles and microballoons

Phase separation

Foams

Composite materials (suspensions)

Surface tension

Surface (free) crystallization

High temperature thermophysical properties
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I. **Why do containerless processing of glasses?**

A. Standard argument

1. Kinetic viewpoint - glass-forming ability, competition of cooling rate vs. crystallization rate

2. Thus, to form new glasses one wishes to suppress crystallization

3. First step in crystallization is nucleation; i.e. preventing nucleation could stop devitrification

4. Nucleation can be greatly aided by liquid being in contact with solid (foreign) surfaces (so called heterogeneous nucleation)

5. The container and impurities from container can be effective heterogeneous nucleation sites

Thus, 6. Containerless processing could prevent crystal nucleation and lead to new family of glasses
B. Required Cooling Rate

1. Define: \( x = \text{volume fraction of crystals formed} \)

\[ I = \text{crystal nucleation rate} \]

\[ g = \text{crystal growth rate} \]

\( t = \text{time}; \ T = \text{temperature} \)

\( R = \frac{dT}{dT} = \text{cooling rate} \)

2. Say for non-isothermal transformation desire \( X \leq X_c \) (where \( X_c << 1 \))

\[
X = \frac{4\pi}{3} \int_{t_1}^{t_f} dt \ I(t) \left[ \int_{t}^{t_f} g(t') dt' \right]^3
\]

\[
= \frac{4\pi}{3} \int_{t_1}^{t_f} \frac{1}{R(T)} I(t) dT \left[ \int_{T}^{T_f} g(T') \frac{1}{R(T')} dT' \right]^3
\]
3. For \( X = X_c \), defines integral equation for \( R(T) \)

4. If functional form of \( R(T) \) given, then parameters in \( R(T) \) can be found

5. For \( R = \text{constant} \)

\[
R_c^* = \frac{4\pi}{3X_c} A
\]

\[
A = \frac{4\pi}{3} \int_{T_i}^{T_f} dT \ I(T) \left[ \int_{T_i}^{T_f} \theta(T') dT' \right]^3
\]

6. (Aside: cooling rate in microgravity situation not constant and fixed unless special cooling apparatus.)

7. From above we note that as \( I(T) \) diminishes, required \( R_c \) is reduced
C. Nucleation

1. Steady State Homogeneous

\[ I_{\text{hom}} = Z \cdot D^* \cdot N_e^* \]

\( Z = \) Zeldovich factor

\( D^* = \) interfacial transport and attempt term and most important term (for present discussion)

\( N_e^* = N^0 \exp\left(-\frac{W^*}{kT}\right) \)

where \( W^* = \) thermodynamic barrier to form critical radius

\( N^0 = \) number of sites/volume (available for nucleation)

2. Steady State Heterogeneous

\[ I_{\text{het}}^* = Z' \cdot D^* \cdot N_e^* \]
\[ N'_b = n_s \exp(-Wf(\theta)/kT) \]

\( n_s = \) number of sites available for heterogeneous nucleation/volume

\[ 0 \leq f(\theta) \leq 1, \text{ where } f(\theta) = (2 - \cos\theta + \cos^3\theta)/4 \]

\( \theta = \) contact angle

Thus, the effective lowering of barrier due to \( f(\theta) \) makes heterogeneous nucleation the commonly observed crystal nucleation mechanism.

D. Comments:

1. Removal of heterogeneous sites can be very effective in reducing \( x \) since \( I_g \) overlap important.

2. Above particularly true for marginal glass formers where \( g \) expected to be large.

3. Homogeneous nucleation could prevent glass formation, but many compositions "immune" due to meager \( I_g \) overlap.

4. Containerless processing may not guarantee homogeneous nucleating conditions.
II. Flight Experiments

A. Delbert Day, P.I.

Mission: D-1 SLM on MEA/A-2

Experiment: 81F01

Sample Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Composition (mol. %)</th>
<th>Diameter (nm)</th>
<th>Rc (earth)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>39.3Ga$_2$O$_3$ - 35.7CaO - 25SiO$_2$ (hot pressed)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11 ± 2 °C/sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>56Ga$_2$O$_3$ - 44CaO (devitrified melt)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>550 ± 50 °C/sec.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6. TTT diagram for the 35.7 CaO-39.3 Ga$_2$O$_3$-25 SiO$_2$, mol%, composition for sample diameter ~3.5 mm.
Figure 13. The planned and observed time-temperature profile for 35.7 CaO-39.3 Ga₂O₃-25 SiO₂, mol%, hot pressed sample (S2) when processed in the single axis acoustic levitator, MEA/A-2.
Figure 11. Flight sample 2 (35.7 CaO-39.3 Ga₂O₃-25 SiO₂, mol%, hot pressed) stuck to platinum wire cage while levitated and melted in space (MEA/A-2). The sample crystallized where it contacted the cage wires.
COOLING CURVE FOR SPL. NO. 2, MEA/A-2

\[ T_m \approx 1445^\circ C \]

ESTIMATED TTT-DIAGRAM
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COOLING ON MEA/A-2
AVERAGE \( R \) (1450-1000\(^\circ C\))
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\( R_c \approx 11.3^\circ C/S \)

TIME, SEC

Figure 25. The estimated TTT diagram for the 35.7 CaO-39.3 Ga\(_2\)O\(_3\)-25 SiO\(_2\), mol\%, composition for sample diameter \( \approx 6.5 \) mm and the cooling rate measured for sample 2 in MEA/A-2.
TABLE XII. Results for the hot pressed calcia-gallia-silica sample (#2) processed on MEA/A-2 experiment.

1. The sample escaped the acoustic energy well and stuck to the cage wires while levitated in the SAAL in space. Escape was clearly associated with the opening of the SAAL cooling shroud gate.

2. 70 to 80% of the sample was glassy. Partial crystallization (≈20%) was observed where the melt touched the platinum wires of the cage. Examination by SEM and EDAX showed that the crystalline phases were Ga$_2$O$_3$ and Ca$_2$Ga$_2$SiO$_7$.

3. Comparison of the critical cooling rate for glass formation of this glass on earth with the cooling rate used in the flight experiment, showed a 2 to 3 times enhancement of glass formation for this composition melted in space.
III. The Other Side of The Coin

A. Since glass-forming is a contest between cooling and crystallization, why not rapid cooling (on earth)?

B. It has been employed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Typical Compositions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liquid Quenching</td>
<td>TiO$_2$ + RO, Al$_2$O$_3$ + Gd$_2$O$_3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Splat Cooling</td>
<td>Metal Alloy Glasses; L$_2$O$_3$-Al$_2$O$_3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L = La, Nd, Gd, Er, . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold Rollers</td>
<td>R$_2$O-TaO$_3$; R$_2$O-NbO$_3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R = Li, Na, K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spinning Wheel</td>
<td>Metal Alloy Glasses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laser Film Melting</td>
<td>Ge, Si, Mixed Chalcogenides</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Other Novel-"Non-Melting" Techniques

1. Sol-gel

2. Gas Phase Deposition Methods
   
   (a) Evaporation

   (b) Sputtering

   (c) Reactive Sputtering

   (d) CVD

   etc.

3. Solid State Methods

   (a) High Pressure

   (b) Shock Tube

   (c) Solid State RXS
Ask again: Why do containerless processing of glasses?

Let us primarily focus on rapid cooling techniques--

A. Limited to ribbon, fragments, etc. - no bulk material

B. No contact could be of greater importance than splat cooling

   e.g. Li₂O-B₂O₃ glass

C. Glass properties can depend on sensitively upon history; i.e. rapidly cooled glass

   will behave differently from ordinary glass. Also, more generally properties can

   depend on how glass is made.

   e.g. Weeks et. al. - electrical conductivity of GeO₂ can depend upon

      melting T

      Galeener et. al. - Raman scattering function of Fictive Temperature

      Hench et. al. - Sol-gel SiO₂; different ρ, uv-cutoff

D. Difference in Properties Imply Structural Differences

   i.e. One is preparing different materials
IV. Two Examples of Interesting Glass Systems

A. CaO-Al₂O₃ System

1. Why interesting?

   Technological: (a) very good IR transmission for oxide glass

   cutoff \( \sim 6 \mu \)

   (b) High Young’s Modulus - use for reinforcement in

   structural composites

   Scientific: (a) Unusual glass-forming system

   (b) Questions regarding structure

2. Glass-Forming Ability

   (a) By normal coating: Narrow region around 65 mole % CaO

   (b) By melt quenching: CaO (59-70%)

   (c) By Splat Cooling (Slivers): CaO (19-81%) (super-quench)
3. Structure/Properties

(a) Structural studies mainly by Raman

(b) Thermal expansion and index measurements of "stable" glasses

(c) Studies have been performed on ternaries (SiO$_2$ or CaF$_2$ additions)

4. Future Work

**Ground based:**

(a) Alternate preparation methods

(b) Study of crystallization behavior

(c) More detailed structural studies (NMR)

**Flight opportunities:**

(a) Glass-forming ability

(b) Bulk samples for structural studies and mechanical property measurements

(c) Optical performance
B. Li$_2$O-B$_2$O$_3$ System

1. Why interesting?

(a) Base composition for wide variety of FIC glasses

(b) Borate structures more varied and complex than silicates due to 3 or 4 fold coordination of B

(c) LB$_2$ first simple borate which seems to exhibit homogeneous crystal nucleation

2. Glass-forming Ability

\[ X\text{Li}_2\text{O} \cdot (1-x)\text{B}_2\text{O}_3 \]

(a) Bulk samples ($0 \leq x \leq .42$) (but special care for larger $x$)

(b) Splat cooling (virtually no advantage)

(c) Quench crucible + dry N$_2$ ($0 \leq x \leq .6$)

(d) Roller method ($0 \leq x \leq .7$)
3. Structure/Properties

(a) Activation energies for DC conductivity appear to decrease monotonically with increasing Li₂O content

(b) High Li₂O content glasses appear to devitrify via surface mechanism - avoidance of contact with substrate important

(c) Detailed IR, Raman and NMR studies have been performed as function of composition

4. Future Work

Ground based: (a) Crystallization studies as a function of composition

(b) Effects of quench rate on structure and properties (electrical)

(c) Effect of nucleation upon conductivity

Flight opportunities: (a) Glass-forming ability

(b) Crystallization behavior

(c) Structure/properties of slowly cooled glasses
V. Summary

1. We have focused on one aspect of containerless glass experimentation:
glass-forming ability

2. We have argued that although containerless processing will abet glass formation,
other ground-based methods can do the "job" better

3. However, these methods have limitations re: sample dimensions and concomitant
ability to make property measurements (e.g. fracture)

4. Most significantly, perhaps, is the observation that glass properties are a function
of preparation procedure

5. Thus, in conclusion, it seems as though there still is an argument for use of
containerless processing for glass-forming
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